

as individuals, are now, and ever have been, united on the principle of the social compact, and as such, are now formed into one nation or people,"—

That is just what we are trying to substantiate, and what the other side are trying to ignore.

—"or that they have ever been so united in any one stage of their political existence, that the people of the several States composing this Union have not, as members thereof, retained their sovereignty; that the allegiance of the citizens has been transferred to the General Government;"—

That is just the doctrine; we say that the Government has been transferred.

—"that they have parted with the right of punishing treason through the respective State governments; and they have not the right of judging in the last resort, as to the extent of the powers reserved, and of consequence of those delegated,—are not only without foundation in truth, but are contrary to the most certain and plain historical facts, and the clearest deductions of reason; and that all exercise of power on the part of the General Government, or any of its departments, claiming authority from such erroneous assumptions, must of necessity be unconstitutional,—must tend directly and inevitably to subvert the sovereignty of the States, to destroy the federal character of the Union, and to rear on its ruins a consolidated government,"—

The very reason of their objection, that it will rear a consolidated government on the ruins of the State.

—"without constitutional check or limitation,"—

So we hear them say that every species of liberty has been usurped by the General Government.

—"and which must necessarily terminate in the loss of liberty itself."

That is what Mr. Calhoun says; and I think these gentlemen must have been reading these resolutions before they made their speeches. They have taken the same view. Now what was Mr. Webster's exposition of those resolutions in that powerful masterly speech in which he reviewed them until there was hardly a man to raise his head in the Congress of the United States to defend them for years afterwards? Mr. Webster says:

"The first two resolutions of the honorable member affirm these propositions, viz:

"1. That the political system under which we live and under which Congress is now assembled, is a compact to which the people of the several States as separate and sovereign communities are the parties."

"2. That these sovereign parties have a right to judge each for itself of any alleged violation of the Constitution by Congress, and in case of such violation, to choose, each for itself, its own mode and measure of redress."

Here is the doctrine of Mr. Calhoun, both as stated in his own resolutions and as stated by Mr. Webster before he begins his reply which utterly demolishes them? They were these same arguments rehashed over here which provoked the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Abbott) to declare that it was the old Calhoun doctrine. I do not care in what skin the animal is wrapped, the ears and the proportions will stick out.

Now I assert this proposition, that so far back as the earliest history of the colonies goes, the people acted together as a united people, and they continued so to act up to the time of the formation of the Constitution. If we go back to colonial times and trace these States up, we shall find that there was never any supreme authority vested in them, either as colonies or as States.

In the first place, the supreme sovereignty was vested in the Crown of Great Britain. Coming down to the Continental Congress of 1774 and '5 and '6, when they declared their independence, when they broke away from the Crown, the supreme allegiance was vested in these Continental Congresses which continued to act for them as a united people until the formation of the Constitution, when the power was vested in the Government of the United States in order to form a more perfect government with three departments, legislative, executive and judicial. In those days, as far back as the resistance to the Stamp Act, we hear the great Otis crying out and pleading for the Union, and saying that the Union was his hope. He wanted that Union to work through the very blood and bones of every new region as it came into the Government. We find it recorded in Bancroft's U. S., vol. 5, page 292:

"Union was the hope of Otis—union that 'should knit and work into the very blood and bones of the original system of every region as fast as settled.'"

And Mr. Gadsden, of South Carolina—I only wish he had been followed by the people of that State instead of Calhoun, for we should not have had these troubles,—says (p. 335):

"I wish the charters may not ensnare us at last by drawing different colonies to act differently in this great cause. Whenever that is the case, all will be over with the whole. There ought to be no New England man, no New Yorker known on the continent, but all of us American."

These were the sentiments of Mr. Gadsden, one of the leaders of South Carolina, as far back as 1765, when the colonies were united under the British Crown. The same sentiments prevailed on the other side of the water. Col. Barré speaks of these as a people that are jealous of their liberties and will maintain them. Lord Camden speaks of them as a great and mighty people. Lord Chatham uses similar terms when he plead against the grievances